



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/325,882	06/04/1999	DAVID E. SINCLAIR	0100.9900390	3412

7590 11/28/2001

CHRISTOPHER J. RECKAMP
MARKISON & RECKAMP, P.C.
P.O. BOX 06229
WACHER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

KIM, HAROLD J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2182

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TR

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/325,882

Applicant(s)

Sinclair et al.

Examiner

Harold Kim

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.
2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. It is present Patent and Trademark Office policy that the title of the invention be as specific with respect to the novel features of the claimed invention.
3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsern et al., US Patent no. 6,263,448.
5. In re claim 1, Tsern et al. shows a power consumption reduction circuit [fig 5] comprising:
 - a memory clock source [155 in fig 9];
 - a memory clock divider circuit [60, 68, 86 and 88 in fig 5; 142 in fig 9], operative to the memory clock source, that generates divided memory clock output signals as a plurality of corresponding independent clock signals and selectively activates at least some of the plurality of independent clock signals in response to received condition data.
6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 2-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsern et al., US Patent no. 6,263,448.

9. In re claim 2, Tsern et al. show the switching circuit disables the output clock signal based on standby mode data [col 2, lines 40-48]. Tsern et al. does not show an engine clock source, a video overlay engine, a video capture engine, I2C control logic and a multimedia port. Official Notice is taken that the engine clock source, the video overlay engine, the video capture engine, I2C control logic and a multimedia port are old and well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device to include the engine clock source, the video overlay engine, the video capture engine, I2C control logic and a multimedia port for purpose of user friendly and more flexible device by allowing it to operate in multiple configurations.

10. In re claim 3, Tsern et al. shows a variable memory clock control circuit [fig 9].

11. In re claim 4, Tsern et al. shows a plurality of memory read latch circuits [60, 68, 106, 80 in fig 5].

12. In re claim 5, Tsern et al. shows a read latch enable signal [tclk in fig 5], a read data latency compensation circuit [col 4, lines 14-24], and a gating circuit [106, fig 5].
13. In re claim 6, Tsern et al. shows a multiplexer [fig 7].
14. In re claim 7, Tsern et al. shows the memory clock divider circuit includes a plurality of logic circuits [fig 7].
15. Claims 8-16 are rejected under the same rationale as discussed above in claims 1-7.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Further references of interest are cited on Form PLO-892, which is attachment to this office action.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 for regular communications (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"), and

(703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the technology center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 746-7240.

Direct any inquiries concerning drawing review to the Drawing Review Branch (703) 305-8404.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harold Kim whose telephone number is (703) 305-1948. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6 AM - 4:30 PM.

Application/Control Number: 09/325,882
Art Unit: 2182


Page 6

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached on (703) 305-9717.

Communications which are not application specific may also be posted on e-mail at harold.kim@uspto.gov.

HK

Harold J. Kim
Patent Examiner
November 19, 2001/HK



THOMAS LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100